

REMARKS

Applicant notes that the present patent application has been reassigned to Examiner Strange from Examiner Reilly since the mail date of the pending Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant has identified Examiner Strange in the caption of the present Submission.

Claims 90-109 were previously presented for examination. Claims 96 and 103 have been cancelled by way of the present response without prejudice, limitation or waiver. Claims 90, 99, and 105 have been amended.

Claims 90-95, 97-102, and 104-109 are currently pending, of which claims 90, 99, and 105 are in independent form.

No new matter has been added.

Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application as currently constituted is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Correspondence Address and Docket Number

Applicant notes that the present Office Action has continued to use the prior agent's correspondence address and attorney docket number with respect to the instant patent application. Applicant has accordingly amended both these items by way of this response.

**Regarding the Provisional Double Patenting Rejections**

In the pending Office Action, claims 90-109 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 126-212 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/207,418 as well as over claims 102-129 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 09/783,726. Applicant appreciates the alleged correspondence drawn in the instant Office Action between the pending claims and the respective sets of conflicting claims. Without acquiescing in the putative correspondence between the claim sets, Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant is willing to file applicable terminal disclaimers in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321 once allowable subject matter in the present patent application is identified. Accordingly, it is requested that the pending double patenting rejections be held in abeyance.

**Regarding the Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

In the pending Office Action, claims 90-109 continue to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AirMobile Communication Server Guide ("AirMobile Software for Lotus cc:Mail Wireless," Motorola Publication, 1995, hereinafter "AirMobile Server") and AirMobile Communication Client Guide

("AirMobile Software for Lotus cc:Mail Wireless," Motorola Publication, 1995, hereinafter "*AirMobile Client*") in view of MAPI Developers Forum Post "MAPI Notification" dated April 12, 1996 (Carthy et al.) and United States Patent No. 5,764,899 to Eggleston et al. as well as United States Patent No. 6,289,105 to Murota.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending \$103(a) rejections have been overcome or otherwise rendered moot by the present response. The embodiments of the present disclosure are directed to a scheme for redirecting information between a messaging host system and a user's wireless mobile data device. As currently claimed, a mail item received at the messaging host system from a sender is addressed to the user's mail address associated therewith. Upon redirection over a wireless network, an encrypted reply mail item is received from the user's wireless mobile data device. Upon decryption of the received reply mail item, it is interfaced to the messaging host system such that the reply mail item is sent to the sender wherein the user's mail address is configured as the reply mail item's originating address.

It is noted that the *AirMobile Server* and *AirMobile Client* references (collectively "*AirMobile*") continue to be relied upon as the primary reference for purposes of maintaining the \$103

rejections in the present Office Action. Although *AirMobile* appears to forward a reply mail item to the sender, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion therein with respect to configuring the user's mail address as the reply mail item's originating address for transmission to the sender. Accordingly, it is believed that *AirMobile* is deficient when applied as a primary reference against the pending base claims as currently constituted. The various secondary references do not appear to address this deficiency for purposes of maintaining a *prima facie* case of obviousness inasmuch as all the claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the combined art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that base claims 90, 99 and 105, and the dependent claims depending respectively therefrom are allowable over the applied art.

**Fee Statement**

Compared to the highest number previously paid for, the number of independent claims has remained the same and the total number of claims has not increased. Applicant is filing herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of the instant patent application, wherein a petition for a one-month extension of time is being filed herewith to extend the time for reply to November 3, 2007. Accordingly, payment via electronic filing is being authorized in the amount of \$930.00 (\$810.00 for the RCE fee and \$120.00 for the 1-month extension). Applicant believes no additional fees are due for the filing of this Submission. If any additional fees are due or any overpayments have been made, however, please charge or credit our deposit account (Deposit Account No. 03-1130).

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

In view of the fact that none of the art of the record, whether considered alone or in combination discloses, anticipates or suggests the present embodiments, as now defined by the independent claims, and in further view of the above amendments and/or remarks, reconsideration of the Action and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Shreen K. Danamraj/  
Shreen K. Danamraj  
Registration No. 41,696

DANAMRAJ & EMANUELSON, P.C.  
Premier Place, Suite 1450  
5910 North Central Expressway  
Dallas, Texas 75206  
Tel (214) 750-5666  
Fax (214) 363-8177